

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Application. The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-17 in the Application. Previously, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 7, 12, 13 and 16, and canceled Claim 17 without prejudice or disclaimer. Presently, no claims have been amended, canceled nor added. Accordingly, Claims 1-16 are currently pending in the Application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 6-8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 6-8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,063,175 to Broadbent (Broadbent) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,228,683 B1 to Manteghi (Manteghi). Presently, independent Claim 1 includes the element that a first region of a conductive layer be insulated from a second region of the conductive layer by a third dielectric layer. The Examiner asserts that such an element is taught by Broadbent, and that the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi teaches or suggests the remaining elements of independent Claim 1.

Contrary to what the Examiner believes, the Applicants contend that the combination of Broadbent with Manteghi is improper. Namely, the Applicants contend that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Broadbent and Manteghi to arrive at the presently claimed invention, without using the present invention as a blueprint to reconstruct the unique design contained in independent Claim 1.

The Applicants argue that the teachings of Broadbent and Manteghi are so substantially different, that their combination would only be obvious after viewing the present invention. For

example, Broadbent is directed to an interlevel dielectric and via scheme for contacting various individual transistors in an integrated circuit. Thus, Broadbent teaches the standard interlevel dielectric and via scheme already known to those skilled in the art for electrically contacting individual transistors in an integrated circuit. In direct contrast to that of Broadbent, however, Manteghi teaches a package for contacting an integrated circuit die. Accordingly, where Broadbent is teaching submicron electrical connections at the individual device level, Manteghi is teaching much larger wiring at the package or die level. As stated above, one skilled in the art would not combine a teaching of forming conductive vias within interlevel dielectric layers such as taught by Broadbent with a teaching of a specific package for wiring an integrated circuit chip or die such as taught by Manteghi, without using the present invention as a blueprint. The law is well settled that such combinations are improper, and therefore, not allowed.

As the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi is improper, and neither of the references alone teaches nor suggests every element of independent Claim 1, the references have failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection with respect to these claims.

II. Rejection of Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadbent in view of Manteghi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,140,707 to Plepys, *et al.* (Plepys). The Applicants previously established that the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi is improper. Accordingly, the Applicants must only determine whether the combination of

Broadbent with Plepys or the combination of Manteghi with Plepys teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Neither combination teaches nor suggests every element of independent Claim 1.

The Examiner is asserting the Plepys reference for the sole proposition that a bond pad may be used in packaging schemes. Notwithstanding the accuracy of the Examiner's assertion, nor whether Plepys may properly be combined with either reference, the combination of Broadbent with Plepys or Manteghi with Plepys still fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 1. Thus, as the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi is improper, and any other combination fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent Claim 1, the references have failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection with respect to these claims.

III. Rejection of Claims 3-5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadbent in view of Manteghi, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,022,787 to Ma (Ma). The Applicants previously established that the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi is improper. Accordingly, the Applicants must only determine whether the combination of Broadbent with Ma or the combination of Manteghi with Ma teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Neither combination teaches nor suggests every element of independent Claim 1.

The Examiner is asserting the Ma reference for the sole proposition that the elements of dependent Claims 3-5 and 9 are obvious. Notwithstanding the accuracy of the Examiner's assertion, nor whether Ma may properly be combined with either reference, the combination of Broadbent with Ma or Manteghi with Ma still fails to teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 1. Thus, as the combination of Broadbent and Manteghi is improper, and any other combination fails to teach or suggest the elements of independent Claim 1, the references have failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection with respect to these claims.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-16.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
HITT GAINES & BOISBRUN, P.C.



Greg H. Parker
Registration No. 44,995

Dated: 12-9-02

HITT GAINES & BOISBRUN, P.C.
P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
Tel: (972) 480-8800
Fax: (972) 480-8865